

REMARKS

Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 are pending. Claims 8, 44 and 49 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunkel et al. ("Kunkel;" U.S. Patent No. 6,477,579) in view of Lemmons et al. ("Lemmons;" U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0034980). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 is not shown or suggested by Kunkel and Lemmons, alone or in combination.

Independent Claims 8, 44 and 49 each recite "wherein said receiving, identifying and communicating are performed automatically without user intervention" (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that Kunkel not only teaches but requires user intervention. Please see, for example, column 2, lines 42-45, of Kunkel.

Applicants further submit that Lemmons does not overcome this shortcoming of Kunkel. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Lemmons, alone or in combination with Kunkel, does not show or suggest performing "said receiving, identifying and communicating ... automatically without user intervention" (emphasis added).

Also, Kunkel is cited as teaching a user profile to screen the set of Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) associated with the program content received by a television, as recited in independent Claims 8, 44 and 49. Applicants respectfully submit that Kunkel does not show or suggest a user profile that resides on the server computer system and that can be used to screen or filter the set of URLs, nor does Kunkel show or suggest a screening or filtering operation in general. Applicants further submit that Lemmons does not overcome this shortcoming of Kunkel.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Kunkel and Lemmons, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 8, 44 and 49, and that Claims 8, 44 and 49 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also submit that Claims 9-11, 13, 45-48 and 50-53 are in condition for allowance because they are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 1/20/06

William A. Zarbis
William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060